

REMARKS

Claims 12 and 13 are allowed. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9-11 are "objected to", and claims 1, 4, 5 and 8 are rejected. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-13 are currently pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Support for amendments to independent claims 1 and 5 can be found at FIG. 5 and page 20 of the Specification.

I. OBJECTION OF CLAIMS 2-3, 6-7 AND 9-11:

"Objected to" claims 2 and 6 have been rewritten into independent form to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, dependent claims 3, 7, 9 and 10, which depend from claims 2 and 6, respectively, are also in condition for allowance. Further, reconsideration of claim 11 is respectfully requested based upon the amendments to claim 5 from which claim 11 depends.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 4, 5 AND 8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) AS BIENG ANTICIPATED BY TSUCHIYA ET AL. (US PATENT NO. 5,448,390; HEREINAFTER "TSUCHIYA"):

Claim 1 has been amended to recite an optical receiver comprising "...transmittable-wavelength-variable filtering means which allows or permits, a light signal in a predetermined transmittable wavelength bandwidth to pass therethrough, out of the WDM light signals input from said optical input port, the light signal to be selectively received by the optical receiver, wherein a central wavelength of said transmittable wavelength bandwidth being a desired wavelength...[and] an optical output port which outputs the remaining light signals out of the WDM light signals input from said optical input port, at wavelengths which do not pass through said transmittable-wavelength-variable filtering means".

Tsuchiya discloses bothway optical communication carried out through a wavelength division multiplex system between first and second terminal stations coupled through an optical cable (see column 5, lines 36-37). Further, each terminal station includes an optical transmitter, an optical receiver and a filter for multiplexing and/or demultiplexing transmitted light and received light (see Abstract and column 5, lines 38-42).

Further, in FIG. 3 of Tsuchiya, the ports of the filters are used in an opposite manner (i.e. opposite phase) in the corresponding means in each terminal station (see column 6, lines 39-41). That is, the light from the transmitter of the first terminal station is forwarded through the

port A₀ of the filter in the first terminal station, to the output port B₀ of the filter, the optical cable, onto the output port B₁ of the filter of the second terminal station and to the input port A₀ of the filter of the second terminal station and onto the optical receiver of the second terminal station (see column 6, lines 24-31). Similarly, the light transmitted from the transmitter in the second terminal station is forwarded through the port A₁ of the filter of the second station, onto the port B₁ of the filter of the second terminal station, through the optical cable, the port B₀ of the filter of the first terminal station and to the port A₁ of the filter of the first terminal station and onto the optical receiver of the first terminal station (see column 6, lines 31-38). Further, in Tsuchiya the bothway communication is carried out by using a single fiber (see FIG. 3).

In FIG. 2B of Tsuchiya, each filter transmits all of the light of the wavelength corresponding to transmittance peaks of the periodical characteristics. Therefore, the filters cannot selectively output only one target wavelength channel signal from the WDM signal. Therefore, the respective receiver cannot receive and identify only one target channel signal.

However, in the present invention, an optical receiver can selectively receive one target channel signal and increase the number of channels using the optical output port.

Further, the present invention increases the suppression of ASE because the filtering means selectively passes one target channel signal.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/829,367

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

March 23, 2005

By:

Deidre M. Davis

Deidre M. Davis

Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501